## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE at WINCHESTER

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	Case No. 4:13-cr-11
	)	Judge Mattice
MICHAEL O. BROWN,	)	Magistrate Judge Lee
Defendant.	) ) )	

## **ORDER**

On October 24, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee filed a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 534) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Magistrate Judge Lee recommended that Defendant's Motion to Suppress Wiretap (Doc. 512) be denied. (Doc. 534 at 9).

Defendant has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the record in this matter, and it agrees with the Magistrate Judge's well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Lee's findings of fact and conclusions of law, and Defendant's Motion to Suppress Wiretap (Doc. 512) is hereby **DENIED**.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Magistrate Judge Lee specifically advised Defendant that he had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. (Doc. 534 at 9); *see* Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(2); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that "[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings").

**SO ORDERED** this 19th day of November, 2014.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE